⊕ BELLSOUTH®

BellSouth Foundation 1155 Peachtree Street, NE Room 7H08 Atlanta, GA 30309-3610 404-249-2396 www.bellsouth.com/foundation A Report on a BellSouth Foundation Special Initiative ReCreating Colleges of Teacher Education



The BellSouth Foundation dedicates this report to the memory of two individuals whose vision and enthusiasm inspired the efforts of everyone committed to the ReCreating Colleges of Education initiative:

Leo Anglin,
late Dean of Education,
Berry College
and
Ray Nystrand,
late Dean of Education,
University of Louisville



- Richard Wisniewski

table of contents

A Letter from the BellSouth Foundation	3
Foreword	5
Executive Summary	6
The Initiative	12
Accomplishments	18
Individual Campus Accomplishments	
Berry College	22
East Carolina University	24
Fort Valley State College	26
Furman University	28
The University of Alabama-Birmingham	30
The University of Florida	32
The University of Louisville	34
Western Kentucky University	36
Lessons Learned	39
Recommendations	44
Closing Note	53
Appendix A: Description of Network Meetings	54
Appendix B: Faculty Perceptions: Survey Questions and Responses	56
Appendix C: Contact Information	60

Committed	to creating	j better teache	ers for the future.

A LETTER FROM THE BELLSOUTH FOUNDATION

As part of its 1996-2000 grantmaking program, the BellSouth Foundation undertook a broad initiative to re-create the way in which institutions of higher learning prepare their students for careers in today's and tomorrow's schools. Our vision was to see the colleges and universities that participated in this initiative completely reinvent their schools of education from the ground up.

While this was a highly ambitious undertaking, we were extremely fortunate to engage Dr. Richard Wisniewski as our lead consultant for the project. His role was to advise us at the Foundation and serve as advocate for the grantees in their campus efforts. Dr. Wisniewski is a past-president of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and was a member of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. He served as Dean of Education at the Universities of Oklahoma and Tennessee, where he accomplished major "re-creations"

himself. He has been active in many efforts to reform teacher preparation.

Dr. Wisniewski is the author of this report, and the information and opinions expressed herein are his own. However, we believe that they constitute a fair, honest analysis of the ReCreating Colleges of Education initiative and of the opportunities for changing higher education in general. In retrospect we realize that our vision for a successfully re-created college of education is an undertaking that will require far more than four years of investment and hard work - and entail more than a campus-bycampus focus. But we are delighted by the many accomplishments of the institutions that participated in the initiative and the increased insights that have arisen overall. We are greatly endebted to the many individuals, and especially the leadership teams on each campus, who made extraordinary contributions to this initiative and dramatically improved teacher education at their institutions.

We are pleased to share the courage and convictions evident in Dr. Wisniewski's recommendations for institutions of higher learning that are truly committed to preparing teachers who will be leaders in tomorrow's schools. While we realize that adopting these recommendations will require a vast paradigm shift for most institutions and for funders, we look forward to seeing what kinds of lasting changes they can inspire among those truly committed to creating better teachers for the future.

- Leslie Graitcer Executive Director BellSouth Foundation

It is	time to	stop th	e music	and wri	te a new	score.

FOREWORD

Foundations and higher education institutions continue to dance together to the music of change. It is an old waltz and the partners long ago mastered the steps, which include embracing new approaches, gliding past anything that looks "programmatic" and moving toward systemic renewal. More often than not, the dance ends with nods and smiles, as each briefly rests before the music begins again.

In his analysis of the BellSouth Foundation's ReCreating Colleges of Teacher Education initiative, Richard Wisniewski suggests, among other things, that it is time to stop the music and write a new score. The ReCreating program was a philanthropically conceived effort to change the way that schools of education are organized and do business. It grew out of an understanding that the steadily evolving context in which schools operate - more diverse student bodies, more rigorous standards, accountability for results, among other things — places new demands on educators. Most of this burden is borne by classroom teachers, and many of them are simply ill-equipped to assume it when they begin their careers. Lack of relevant preparation has a high cost: in missed learning opportunities, in lost hope and in truncated careers.

In partnering with postsecondary institutions that had embarked on serious examination of their teacher education programs and taken at least some initial steps to change them, the ReCreating effort sought to add new dimensions to existing reform activities: institutions agreed to reinvent themselves in ways that would enable them to graduate new teachers who understood and were ready to embrace the challenges awaiting them. The author's own experience as Dean of the College of Education at the University of Tennessee demonstrated that wholesale transformation of a school of education was possible. The fact that the partner institutions had already made a commitment to some kind of change reinforced the belief that comprehensive re-creation was achievable at greater scale.

A good deal was accomplished. New relationships with schools and school systems, changed curricula, different uses of time and resources and a few novel ways of rewarding faculty performance all emerged from the initiative. Two of the institutions reinvented themselves as charter colleges of education. Yet, at many schools true "re-creation" did not take place during the program period. There are a number of reasons for this, not least of which involved under-estimating the time it would take to realize change and shifts in key leadership at several institutions.

Beyond these, though, and at least as important, is what the author refers to as "the culture of higher education." In this culture, high-level administrators disappear once the grant is awarded. Reward systems, which recognize publication in the right journals, make faculty reluctant to commit significant amounts of time to the often thankless work of connecting to public school personnel or of advising students. Departments remain compartmentalized and there are no incentives for liberal arts faculty to engage their colleagues who teach "education." It is not surprising, then, that the participating institutions were, on the whole, considerably more successful in changing course and curriculum content — where faculty have control than in reordering institutional structures, which requires campuswide leadership, collaboration among diverse interests, and mutual recognition of the benefits of change.

If real transformation is to occur, Wisniewski argues, we must alter the dance's pattern. Specific goals, regular participation by those with authority to implement comprehensive change, and accountability in the form of measurable outcomes and sanctions for failing to meet them are the direction in which we should move. In this proposed new arrangement, philanthropy must lead.

Robert A. Kronley
 Senior Consultant
 BellSouth Foundation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Initiative

In 1996, the BellSouth Foundation announced its ReCreating Colleges of Teacher Education initiative. This five-year program was conceived not to help colleges and universities simply improve their teacher preparation programs, but to completely reinvent them from the ground up. The goal was to spur a small number of competitively selected institutions to become hallmark examples of leading-edge thinking in preparing educators for the future.

Eight institutions participated in the ReCreating initiative: Berry College and Fort Valley State University (GA); East Carolina University (NC); Furman University (SC); the University of Alabama – Birmingham; the University of Florida; the University of Louisville (KY); and Western Kentucky University. These institutions competed with a field of more than 75 to earn three-year grants ranging from \$150,000 to \$250,000 for planning and implementing their ideas to redesign and rebuild their schools of education.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The goals outlined by each campus were comprehensive, but each chose a particular niche of its own:

- Berry College set out to create an entirely new "charter college of education" and emphasize multi-cultural understanding.
- East Carolina University wanted to find a way to serve both mainstream undergraduate students and practicing teachers without full certification, with action research as a focal point for school/college collaboration.
- Fort Valley State University set its sights on a new standards-based approach to learning about teaching, with continuous assessment and a student support structure built into its "charter college of education."
- Furman University decided to launch a five-year program, including a paid internship.

- The University of Alabama-Birmingham wished to link more closely with local schools and model technology use.
- The University of Florida planned to build on its current five-year program, merging special education with elementary education and adopting a student cohort model.
- The University of Louisville undertook the creation of a new masters-level program, structured around education reform needs and issues of practicing teachers, organized in student cohorts.
- Western Kentucky University targeted student assessment and working with K-12 schools.

The BellSouth Foundation provided multiple opportunities and encouragement for campus initiative leaders to create a solid network among themselves and to share expertise and lessons learned. Members of this network met regularly to discuss challenges, ideas and successes. They also presented their experiences with colleagues across the country at various meetings and conferences.

The Foundation established several technology-based methods for interaction, including listservs and websites for participant use.

The Foundation and its lead consultant for the initiative,
Dr. Richard Wisniewski (also the author of this report), maintained regular contact with each campus during the initiative to monitor progress. In some cases, where work was not making satisfactory progress after the first year, because of mistargeted goals or a lack of ongoing commitment, the Foundation asked participating campuses to rethink and resubmit their plans in order to receive continued funding.

Results and Lessons Learned

Needless to say, the ReCreating initiative was an extremely ambitious undertaking — one of the more ambitious programs of its kind undertaken by a private foundation. Results of the initiative at the campus level — as well as the ways of defining them and measuring them - are as varied as the eight institutions themselves. While none has yet achieved the complete transformation envisioned at the start of the initiative, almost all made important and significant strides. They discovered that the scope of work and the commitment required to achieve complete change in a college of education were broader than anyone realized at the outset.

Some elements of success were common to all campuses:

- All of the colleges substantially increased their collaborative working relationships with schools. Doing so helped to curtail the pervasive fragmentation between traditional teacher education curricula and "real-life" work and needs in schools.
- They all moved toward longer and more intensive practical experiences for their students. These efforts included plans for increasing diversity and multi-cultural experiences among students, creating higher standards for evaluating student performance, augmenting the use of technology among both faculty and students, and giving faculty as well as students more time in school settings.
- They all grappled with the difficulties of how to reward faculty for working more closely with schools in an academic culture that often does not value such work.
- They each sought new ways to build increased linkages with the schools of arts and sciences, and collaborative courses were offered in many cases.

The holistic lessons learned across all campuses are telling for any institution that wishes to transform its teacher preparation program — and for any funder or organizational partner that desires to share in that endeavor:

The Culture of Higher Education Must Transform

The BellSouth Foundation's experience showed that basic fundamental changes must take place within the culture of higher education itself if better teacher preparation is to emerge. Faculty and staff currently do not have the flexibility or security needed to step "outside the box" of traditional academia. Current culture is more likely to reward rigid adherence to specific disciplines and isolation from the K-12 environment and from other campus departments - making the move to a multidisciplined, multi-level partnership approach to teacher education extremely challenging. Even when an individual campus alters its approach, the broader expectations of academia may make individual faculty reluctant to break from the norm.

Administrators' Roles are Crucial

The buy-in and continuous support of top administrators are crucial to the success of any attempt to redefine teacher education. In many cases, the initial enthusiasm or support shown by administrators waned as each campus program got underway. On several of the campuses, turnovers occurred in the top administrative positions and deanships that often created disruptions in the change processes underway.

Grant Size is Not an Indicator of Success

The amount of the grant awarded had absolutely no correlation to the level of a program's success. The critical factors were how the money was spent, how creative and committed the leadership team and the degree of willingness to reallocate existing resources.

Recommendations

Drawing on his observations and leadership in the Re-Creating program, as well as on lessons learned from a career in teacher education reform efforts, Dr. Wisniewski offers a series of recommendations for institutions and funders. He acknowledges that some of these will be considered unorthodox and that few will be met without debate.

Tie Money to Results

Most directly, Dr. Wisniewski suggests that if agreed-upon outcomes are not met by a specified date, grant monies should be returned to the funding source. An environment without consequences does not foster the level of commitment, attention or creativity necessary for true change. While seemingly harsh, this measure could help ensure that those seeking funds for re-creating teacher education are truly committed to that work.

Require Tangible Evidence of Commitment

Also along the lines of ensuring that all those working on teacher preparation projects are personally committed, the author recommends requiring that project faculty and staff as well as administrative leaders provide written statements of their intended roles in any teacher education improvement efforts. The more specific these statements, the more likely positive changes will be achieved.

Focus on Implementation

While a large number of foundation grants have traditionally been intended, at least in part, to fund planning activities, Dr. Wisniewski suggests that funders redirect their resources exclusively to the work of implementation. Planning is and should be something that faculty, staff, students and other

team members undertake on their own. College faculty have more opportunities and degrees of freedom than any other profession to engage in meetings and planning as a normal part of their responsibilities. By focusing on implementation funding, foundations can help ensure more tangible results from their philanthropic investments in teacher education reform.

Prescribe Expectations

The author also recommends that, rather than allow institutions of higher education to completely define their own outcomes and mileposts, funders should take a more prescriptive approach — clearly articulating specific changes in teacher preparation programs that they are willing to fund. This approach would help channel funding directly to the faculty and students doing the work, rather than to peripheral expenses such as supplies, travel and general administration.

Create Five-Year Programs

Five-year teacher education programs are highly encouraged by the ReCreating findings to date, as well as by extensive amounts of literature in the field. Specifically, five-year programs allow candidates to earn undergraduate degrees in the arts and sciences before proceeding to specific teaching curricula. Intensive internship and induction experiences must become a standard part of the program, based on full collaboration and partnerships with K-12 schools.

Create Charter Colleges of Education

The charter college concept, like the ones put into place at Berry College and Fort Valley State University, is one of the most promising models to emerge from the ReCreating initiative

to date. Dr. Wisniewski recommends that charter colleges be created either by transitioning current programs and students gradually to new curricula and experiences, or by establishing entirely new institutions from the ground up. The possibilities for structure, teaching practices, faculty roles, curriculum design, relationships with outside schools, admissions and assessments – as well as state waivers - are far broader than most academics are able to envision or willing to consider. While creating a charter college will not be easy, foundations and other funders are in a position to encourage and assist in these efforts. The choice is between making minor investments in modest changes at a larger number of schools, or fewer, more significant investments at colleges and universities that are willing to go the distance.

Employ Differentiated Staffing

Beyond the scope of higher education only, the author recommends that differentiated staffing in both colleges of education and in K-12 schools - organizing instructional programs around multi-disciplined teams of teachers, interns and other professionals — be an integral part of the way all teachers are trained and inducted into service. It should be the way all schools are organized. Internships should be the norm for the induction of all new teachers. This differentiated approach would form a natural way for colleges of teacher education and K-12 schools to integrate their work to produce better prepared educators.

Conclusion

The true measure of success for each campus in the ReCreating Colleges of Teacher Education initiative will be fully apparent over the next few years. This success will depend on whether participating colleges and universities continue with their plans and see their commitment to change through to its completion. While the three-year term of BellSouth Foundation funding was enough to give each a solid foothold, a longer period is needed to ensure that initial goals are realized.

On a regional level, however, the benefits of the ReCreating initiative are already apparent. As a group, the participating institutions learned to collaborate and share expertise with one another in a way previously unheard of in the higher education community. As a result of that support network, they were able to make changes that would never have been possible if each was working in isolation. This collaborative spirit has added to a new sense of momentum for change in teacher education that is steadily growing throughout the southeast region and accelerated by other regional factors. Strong faculty leaders emerged during the process. The BellSouth Foundation is excited by this progress and looks forward to remaining a part of sharing, learning, invention and change.



- Richard Wisniewski

In 1997, the BellSouth Foundation initiated an effort to assist eight southeastern colleges and universities to re-create their teacher education programs — with the ultimate hope of spurring a renaissance in teacher preparation around the region. This report describes the goals of the initiative, the selection of the funded institutions, major outcomes and some of the lessons learned. It also offers recommendations for ways in which philanthropy might effect deeper change in teacher education in the future.

While the lessons learned are of prime interest to the BellSouth Foundation, they also will be of interest to colleges seeking help from foundations to support similar activities. We hope they will be of value as well to other foundations and policy makers who seek ways to accelerate the reform of teacher education.

The author served as a consultant to the BellSouth Foundation for the ReCreating Colleges of Teacher Education initiative. He is responsible for the views expressed and they do not necessarily reflect those of the Foundation.

THE INITIATIVE

In 1995, the BellSouth Foundation determined that the reform of teacher education would be a high priority during 1996-2000. But what could it do that had not been attempted many times by other foundations?

Over several decades, private foundations have provided grants to colleges of education to strengthen or reform teacher education. There is little doubt that these efforts were successful to some degree, depending on their scope and the effectiveness of those doing the work. These efforts surely benefited the students and faculty closest to the purposes of a given grant. Many of the projects were of a pilot nature in hopes that they would influence the mainstream of teacher preparation. The mainstream, however, remains remarkably resistant to change.

During its initial ten years, BellSouth Foundation made a host of grants designed to improve public education in the southeastern United States. While the quality of teaching in K-12 schools was a major theme, a number of colleges of education also received support to improve facets of their programs.

Every five years, BellSouth Foundation assesses the impact of its efforts and sets new goals it will emphasize during its next funding cycle. Based

on a series of meetings with education experts and business leaders in 1995, the Foundation determined that the reform of teacher education would be a high priority during 1996-2000.

But what could the Foundation do that had not been attempted many times by other foundations?

The answer was to launch an initiative that would encourage institutions to implement on a broad scale the reform ideas that had become a mantra in education circles but were being undertaken only here and there throughout the region. The goal was to select institutions that had begun such changes and were ready to make a far more dramatic transformation across the board. They had to be prepared to move beyond pilot or piecemeal changes.

The Foundation also wanted to demonstrate a regional approach to teacher education reform by encouraging the institutions it would support to work together and become an example for others.

The RFP Process

BellSouth Foundation sent out a Request for Proposal (RFP) to more than 300 colleges of education in the Southeast (all members of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education). The RFP was based on a series of assertions regarding teacher preparation that reflected what the literature, professional associations, critics and others insisted needed to be done:

- Excellent colleges of education practice what they preach.
- Excellent colleges of education model diversity in the composition of faculty, students and curricula.
- Excellent teachers are best prepared where teaching is done and where school renewal is underway.
- Excellent teachers are best prepared in institutions that place a high value on teacher education and where strong institution-wide commitments support such programs.

- Excellent colleges of education demonstrate and model the uses of technology to enhance teaching, learning and assessment.
- The need to change practices of colleges of education is immediate and compelling.

The assertions conveyed to applicants what the Foundation valued and expected to be addressed in the plan for reform. They served to guide the selection process and the evaluation of progress over a three-year period. As broad as the assertions may seem, they were useful in limiting the tendency to add ever more items to the litany of needed changes in teacher education.

A Note About the RFP Process In retrospect, it is now clear that another assertion needed to be added, emphasizing the need to connect teacher preparation to student attainment in the K-12 schools where the new teacher graduates would be placed. Gathering data on this linkage is difficult but is now an expectation voiced by both friends and foes of teacher education. It must be at the forefront of any future list of expectations.

The need for data on the changes being made also should have been more explicitly expressed in the RFP. A plan for data and research needs to be a prime requirement in any future initiatives. Higher education as a whole, while committed to research in theory, is not known for conducting research on the efficacy of its own programs. If this is not specifically required, it will remain a low priority on most campuses.

The Selection Process

The request for proposals asked each institution to outline what it had already done to improve programs and to offer a plan for scaling up the changes that would be transformational in nature, within the framework of the assertions. The phrase "ReCreating Colleges of Education" was coined to help emphasize the level of changes needed.

Seventy-five institutions submitted proposals, including public and private, large and small. After being evaluated independently by each member of a three-person panel, a dozen promising proposals were identified. The review panel consisted of the director of the Foundation, the Foundation's senior consultant, and myself as consultant to the initiative. Our team worked closely together over the three-year period.

We invited the highest ranked group of campuses to the Foundation's offices for intensive discussions. Each institution sent a team that included the president or provost of the university, the dean of education, and the key faculty members who would lead the change process.

Each meeting took half a day and was characterized by probing questions from our evaluation team to try to get below the surface of the written proposal. Institutions had to convince the Foundation that this initiative would be a pervasive effort on the part of the faculty and administrators.

The Foundation's goal was to work with a representative group of institutions, i.e., public and private, large and small, historically Black, liberal arts and research colleges. The eight institutions selected were:

- Berry College (Georgia)
- East Carolina University (North Carolina)
- Fort Valley State University (Georgia)
- Furman University (South Carolina)
- The University of Alabama-Birmingham
- The University of Florida
- The University of Louisville (Kentucky)
- Western Kentucky University

The grants awarded to each institution ranged from \$150,000 to \$250,000. Each institution was required to allocate institutional matching monies after the first year of funding. The Foundation strongly encouraged each institution to announce its grant in a public way. Celebratory events included faculty, students, teachers and administrators. They served to inform the campus and community about the purposes of the grant and to build support and momentum.

A Note About the Selection Process The selection process was one of the strengths of the initiative. It was designed to communicate high expectations, to involve key leaders at the college and campus levels, and to create a network of institutions working on common goals. The time and money invested in this process were well spent. Strong personal bonds between the Foundation and the leadership teams at each institution were forged, thus facilitating candid feedback to the participants. In retrospect, site visits also would have been beneficial.

Implementing the Initiative

Creating A Network

To accomplish its goal of a regional impact, BellSouth Foundation decided to create a network of its grantees. It took this approach in hopes that the grantees would become, in effect, a collective voice for reform. The Foundation also believed that persons engaged in reform can be reinforced in their efforts by meeting with others engaged in the same work. In its strong commitment to devote planning, research and resources to the network approach, the Foundation served in essence as a "ninth partner" in the eight-campus initiative.

The Foundation organized three or more network meetings each year so that the colleges could exchange information, hear from experts and visit others doing exemplary work. Colleges sent teams of five or six persons to the network meetings, and often paid for additional participants beyond those covered by the Foundation.

In addition, the Foundation took advantage of meetings regularly attended by the grantees, such as the annual meetings of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) and the American Educational Research Association (AERA). Members of the initiative presented each year at these meetings and also arranged network gatherings. A list and description of all the network meetings and topics appears in Appendix A.

Monitoring Progress

Deans and directors of the project met annually with the Foundation's director and consultants to discuss progress made, problems encountered and plans for the succeeding year. The consultant and the executive director of the Foundation also visited the campuses periodically.

The first annual assessment of progress surfaced three instances in which there appeared to be serious problems. The Foundation asked these grantees to revise their plans and even communicated with the presidents and provosts to discuss the need for higher level attention. Second year funding was delayed to these grantees until specific questions were addressed by the institutions.

A Note About the Network The frequency and regularity of the network gatherings served to build a valued sense of camaraderie among the participants who commented frequently on the benefit of these meetings. As a result, individuals contacted one another for advice and information. Several campuses sent teams to visit each other and later added new efforts as a result of what they learned.

A Note About Monitoring Progress These matters were handled as tactfully as possible since the Foundation did not want to interfere in internal matters. At the same time, such attention communicated the seriousness of the Foundation's commitment to the initiative. The interventions had the effect of re-energizing efforts on all three campuses. In two instances, the initial proposals were completely redesigned with great success. In the third, the redesign remained problematic and funding was reduced. If the Foundation had not probed the situations developing on these campuses, their re-creating efforts certainly would have failed.

Use of Technology

The Foundation attempted to foster a collegial spirit among the grantees through the use of technology. A web page and two listservs devoted to the ReCreating initiative were developed by the Foundation. One listserv enabled the campus leadership teams to talk privately. The second provided an open forum for all the faculty members involved.

The goal was to encourage discussion of issues, to enable institutions to post events and accomplishments and to share news items. Another goal was to model the use of technology as an effective means of communication. One campus set an example by posting copies of working documents and products integral to their re-creating work. The other campuses were encouraged to use and adapt these materials as they wished. These information sources also served to facilitate regional dissemination of the work being done.

Overall, the Foundation did everything it could to serve as a cheer-leader and facilitator of the grantees' efforts and the network's overall result. The network provided opportunities for persons to learn from one another, to support one another in what is often frustrating work, and to maintain momentum over a long period of time. Network activities resulted in work that might not have happened without the insights that occurred as persons learned and gained support from one another.

A Note About Technology Use Despite repeated encouragement, the online forum never fully blossomed. It was reasonably active in the first year when the colleges posted copies of their proposals, announcements of their kick-off celebrations, and other items. A few deans and key faculty members posed questions and responded to others but the anticipated free flow of information and opinion never became as widespread as envisioned.

Two subtle factors embedded in the culture of higher education may partially explain why this medium did not work as anticipated: 1) Spontaneity is not a characteristic of life in higher education and the electronic medium calls for rapid responses. Many faculty members fear criticism if they appear to brag about accomplishments, examine problems or discuss work that is not part of "research." 2) There is also a hesitancy for faculty to speak for their institution, this role seen as the responsibility of deans and other administrators. Whatever the explanations, the end result is the same: electronic networking never "took off" to the degree hoped for.

Despite mixed results, electronic networks should be utilized at every opportunity. Every medium available is needed to forward the cause of teacher education reform and bring it into the public domain.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

There are two approaches to evaluating the accomplishments of the eight campuses: What was achieved can be assessed campus by campus, comparing what was done with the original proposals and with the original assertions. Another approach is to examine what was accomplished in the aggregate by identifying major themes throughout the region. In this report we use the latter approach, although summaries of successes on individual campuses are highlighted on special pages and in an accompanying document.

While each campus had particular priorities and goals, some elements were common to them all.

- All of the colleges increased their collaborative working relationships with schools. They expanded agreements to work with practicing teachers on the preparation of new teachers both on campus and in selected schools.
- All made changes in their teacher education courses. To varying degrees, several campuses developed teams of faculty, sometimes including practicing teachers, working with cohorts of students. Doing so helped to curtail the pervasive fragmentation between courses and work in schools.
- They all moved toward longer, more intensive and more practical learning experiences for their students.
 Recruiting a diverse student body was a common goal, but the results

were not sanguine. Multi-cultural experiences were added by most. Efforts were made to enhance the use of technology in all programs.

- They all engaged in the examination of standards in relation to their course expectations. Linkages with the arts and sciences were increased.
- They all grappled with the difficulties of rewarding faculty for working more closely with schools in an academic culture that often does not value such work. Some made changes in load assignments so that faculty would spend more time in school settings.

The list goes on and it reflects what many colleges across the nation are attempting to do with or without grants. In the ReCreating effort, the grants enabled faculty to move expeditiously and comprehensively.

Faculty Perceptions

Improvement vs. Invention

The Foundation was adamant in its expectation that the grants should not be treated as "just another funded project," where activity was restricted to those who wrote the proposal. Faculty-wide involvement was both expected and promised. However, the degree to which the initiative permeated the entire faculty is a key concern. While there is no doubt that each campus had a core of dedicated and competent teacher educators who championed the changes made, the initiative remained more of a project than a serious reform process on several campuses.

So what of the other faculty members who were perhaps not as deeply involved? As the ReCreating initiative was coming to a close, a survey was mailed to 371 faculty members across the eight campuses. One hundred and thirty-one persons responded, a response rate of 35%. While a reasonable rate of return, it was nonetheless disappointing. If the ReCreating effort had deeply involved the faculties at all eight institutions, a higher rate of response was a reasonable expectation. This fact in itself is a finding regarding the depth of faculty involvement.

Overall, the faculty survey responses confirm that progress was made on all of the campuses, even if expectedly uneven or even contentious. Different faculty members saw different parts of the process and have different opinions. Appendix B includes the survey instrument and a tabulation of responses.

To some the phrase "re-creating" evidently communicated the need to improve current practices rather than reinvent them — a process that does not necessarily lead to fundamental changes. The difference between altering a few courses or programs and beginning with a fresh slate is profound.

The latter approach is very difficult for faculty in any discipline. Fears that one's specialty will be devalued and the difficulty of overcoming years of conditioning to existent practices both come into play. Even when a particular campus is willing to be flexible and to reward nontraditional work in its promotion and tenure decisions, often individual faculty

members remain fearful of straying beyond the age-old "publish or perish" view. They fear that future mobility to positions of leadership on other campuses may be hampered as a result of nontraditional job activity. These are only some of the factors at work.

The organization, traditions and hierarchical nature of decision-making at universities are not conducive to innovation despite rhetoric to the contrary. And most obviously, the relentless press of working with students in the old program while redesigning that program drains the energy of many.

Overall, the major breakthroughs that emerged were fewer than hoped for. Practices were polished far more than re-created.

The difference between altering a few courses or programs and beginning with a fresh slate is profound. Overall practices were polished far more than re-created.

The Evolving Nature of "Success"

What More?

Offering these evaluative comments in no way diminishes the very real progress made at the campuses. It must be stressed that what the institutions promised to do was to make changes that would only become fully operational after the initiative had ended. The colleges embarked on activities that were dependent on inevitably slow consensus building and institutional approval processes. It is heartening that all of them actually implemented many changes in years two and three. Scaling-up all of the changes to full implementation levels within three years proved to be very difficult.

The question of whether the initiative was "successful" on each campus is somewhat premature given the above expectation. More to the point, was the Foundation realistic in expecting a full re-creation of campus programs in three years? At the outset, all eight institutions convinced the Foundation that they were ready and eager to make the changes outlined in their proposals. As things turned out, most of the institutions still had much work to do to achieve a strong faculty consensus on what their proposals promised. Working with other campus departments also required more time than anticipated.

Yet, most institutions are close to fulfilling what they promised in their proposals. Louisville's new masters program is a major shift given that most colleges of education have not significantly altered their graduate programs for teachers. Fort Valley is making a profound philosophical as

well as programmatic shift in its work with teacher education students. What they are attempting is no less than a redefinition of an institution's commitment to its students with an emphasis on outcome rather than input. Berry has reinvented every part of its program as a charter college of education. Furman's five-year program is very radical for a private, liberal arts college and can claim "re-creation" if it stays the course on which it has embarked. Florida has altered and merged its elementary and special education programs. East Carolina has made "action research" with participating teachers a primary commitment and highlight of its work. The other two campuses likewise achieved important results.

Still to be known, however, is whether college leadership teams and campus administrations will renew their vows and continue the progress made. The vagaries of leadership and changing commitments on any campus, as well as political expediencies imposed by states, preclude any absolute predictions, but several campuses show strongly positive signs.

Furthermore, the region as a whole has made great strides. The Foundation can be assured along with the colleges that what was accomplished was all in the right direction. It was a positive undertaking for all concerned. But was it enough? What else could have been done? What can a foundation like BellSouth do to escalate the scale and types of changes made? Answering these questions is vital to determining how foundations can have the greatest possible impact on advancing teacher preparation reforms in the future.

The question of whether the initiative was "successful" on each campus is somewhat premature. Yet, most institutions will have fulfilled most of what they promised in their proposals.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS Individual Campus Accomplishments

Berry College	page 22
East Carolina University	page 24
Fort Valley State University	page 26
Furman University	page 28
The University of Alabama-Birmingham	page 30
The University of Florida	page 32
The University of Louisville	page 34
Western Kentucky University	page 36

BERRY COLLEGE

Rome, Georgia, private college, 514 education students

• Create a Charter College of Education.

• Prepare graduates able to work in culturally diverse classrooms.

Consultant's Summary:

From the outset, Berry College set out to create the Berry Charter College of Education. As a small, private, liberal arts college, it did not need approval beyond its campus to make this claim. The "charter" designation was to communicate the breadth of changes that they were making in curricula, in the way faculty work with students, and in their relationships with local schools. The Berry faculty underscored its determination to work on a host of changes when each member of the faculty co-signed the proposal to the Foundation. The program is built on a number of recommendations from the report, *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future* (1996).

Despite the tragic and untimely deaths of both the original education dean and the college president, the effort never faltered. The new dean saw as her mission to fulfill and even go beyond the original plans. The new president supported and acknowledged the work being done in many tangible ways, notably by recommending that a newly renovated building in a prominent location on campus be given to and renovated for the college of education. Berry served as a prominent leader among the ReCreating network.

The College's Report:

Activities/Accomplishments:

Berry's approach incorporates strong ties to the liberal arts and the liberal arts faculty. Culturally responsive practice focuses on a required English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) endorsement, a "May semester" in a culturally diverse community, and a strong program of recruitment and support for minority teacher candidates. School-based practice includes a year-long student teaching experience, consistent work in one of Berry College's Professional Development Schools in northwest Georgia, and a faculty committed to serving in the public schools the equivalent of one day each week.

Links between the teacher education program and the Professional Development Schools allow students and faculty to observe and help develop best practice in local classrooms. Berry faculty incorporate a variety of technologies and approaches in teaching Berry's innovative curriculum. Through fully integrated content and models of team teaching, this 21st century program aims to prepare some of the best teachers in the Southeast.

Berry offers both undergraduate and graduate teacher education programs, currently enrolling well over 500 students. The undergraduate program features:

BERRY COLLEGE

- An Orientation to Teacher
 Education Course. Taken during
 the freshman or sophomore year,
 it familiarizes students with the
 practice of teachers and helps
 them determine if teaching is
 a good career choice.
- English for Speakers of Other Language Endorsement (ESOL).
 Because so many people in elementary, middle and secondary schools are non-native speakers of English, all students earn an ESOL endorsement as part of their Georgia teaching certificate.
- A May experience in a diverse culture. Students will analyze the context of another culture, locally, statewide or abroad.
- A year-long student teaching experience requires students to work in the same classroom for two semesters.
- Professional Development Schools expose students to best-practice in our partner schools.
- Professional Seminars are offered during student teaching to help students clarify their philosophy of education, hone their classroom management style and develop an innovative teaching portfolio.
- Team-taught courses allow several faculty members to work together to implement the course content of pedagogy courses.

- Year-long and extended time blocks of courses in the teacher education sequence give students the opportunity to develop an array of effective teaching techniques in a meaningful time frame.
- Technologically enhanced instruction brings learning to life and gives students expertise on how to integrate emerging technologies in their own teaching.
- An education and human sciences building, designed specifically for the teacher education program and including two classrooms for children, will open in late 2001.

Goals of the graduate curricula are based on the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards propositions and include:

- Gain intensive knowledge of individual growth and development as well as principles of learning applicable to each student.
- Evaluate exemplary curricula and appropriate instructional technology useful for enhancing the learning experiences of all students.
- Gain a comprehensive knowledge of historical trends, legal requirements, and innovations in education as revealed by current research.
- Critically examine practice and seek to adapt teaching to new ideas.
- Become more competent in a variety of teaching methodologies to enhance student learning of subject matter.

- Develop classroom settings and school arrangements that promote an environment conducive to optimum learning experiences for students.
- Learn to use multiple methods to evaluate one's own teaching, class learning and the educational growth of each student.
- Acquire knowledge of social, cultural and linguistic diversity as they relate to effective planning in the classroom.
- Work collaboratively to maintain appropriate human relationships with students, teachers, parents and administrators.
- Understand ways to guide students in developing cognitive, affective and psychomotor skills.

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY

Greenville, North Carolina, public university, 1500 education students

Goals:

- Serve both mainstream undergraduate students and practicing teachers.
- Bridge the cultures of school and university.
- Promote sustained research into real school problems.

Consultant's Summary:

East Carolina University (ECU) is the largest teacher preparation program in North Carolina. The large student body provided challenges for the re-creation process and meant that a host of goals needed to be addressed. The college needed to expand an exemplary pilot effort in order to deal not only with changes in its mainstream undergraduate program but also to serve the many practicing teachers without full certification in local schools. One of its major breakthroughs was the creation of faculty-teacher research teams, each group conducting an inquiry directly related to the work of teachers. East Carolina used its grant to make such "action research" a high priority. It published a monograph describing these projects. The faculty demonstrated that working closely with teachers is fully compatible with meeting the research requirements of a university. This was essentially an elusive goal at other colleges, although several visited ECU, learned about this approach, and added it to their work. ECU's dean began as project director and was named dean in the first year. She continued to serve as project director as well as dean.

The University's Report:

Activities/Accomplishments:

Resources from the ReCreating grant were used primarily to develop new mechanisms and enhance existing strategies for partnership work with public schools. Highlights of this work included:

Partnership Advisory Board. This board serves as the coordinating mechanism for all activities and initiatives of the partnership. It consists of 15 liaisons from participating school districts, three teachers who rotate each year among the districts, teacher education faculty, clinical schools staff, and the director of the partnership. The advisory board has addressed such issues as diversity of student populations, recruitment of minority students and faculty, and professional development for clinical teachers.

Curriculum/Program Revision. ECU now undertakes all revisions of undergraduate and graduate curricula and programs with input from school partners. Resources cover pay for substitutes, stipends for teachers and funds for the summer development work of collaborative committees. More and more, these efforts are being driven by research that focuses on particular areas of the teacher education program.

Year-long Senior Internship. All students in teacher education participate in a year-long senior internship. Staff have developed many useful materials for coordinating the experience and managing the continuing communication necessary for it to work well, such as handbooks, agreement forms and seminars.

Professional Development Schools.

Although all 15 school districts are part of a professional development system within the partnership, three schools in Pitt County, where ECU is located, serve as PDSs. A steering committee includes the three principals; the associate superintendent of Pitt County Schools; the associate dean of the ECU School of Education; the director of clinical experiences at ECU; three faculty coordinators from elementary, middle, and secondary school areas; teachers from each school: and the PDS coordinator. At each school site, a leadership team involves the appropriate faculty coordinator in planning and implementation.

Clinical Teacher Training. Training for clinical teachers has been enhanced through numerous continuing professional development programs. ECU now emphasizes a more formal, developmental model of continuing education for clinical teachers.

Lateral-Entry Programs. As the need for alternative licensure programs escalates, ECU has focused substantial resources on two initiatives: Project Act, an intensive five-week program for lateral-entry teachers; and a Lateral-Entry Symposium. ECU envisions continual expansion in this area.

Research and Development. ECU has devoted resources to support research projects in line with the School of Education's research agenda and public school issues. Particular emphasis goes to collaborative action research involving both teacher education and public school faculties.

To share its research, ECU published a monograph entitled Excellence Through Partnerships: Research in Action, which highlights and describes ten collaborative action-research projects. It has funded more than 25 such projects, involving more than 40 teacher education faculty and 30 school personnel.

Typically, higher education faculty are rewarded for teaching, research and scholarly publishing, not partnership work. Throughout 1998-99 a School of Education committee, consisting of faculty, the associate dean and the dean, conducted focus groups to elicit comments on and analyses of present faculty roles and ways of evaluating performance. The committee now is proposing and sharing some new models. The intent is to recognize faculty involvement in school-based teacher education activities and research.

Other outcomes include:

Promising Practices

A professional development model that consistently involves both the higher education faculty member and the practitioner creates a kind of parity that the partnership believes it needs in order to ensure deep, sustained collaborative work. Action research on real school problems supports this model and integrates the advanced, theoretical knowledge of university educators and the applied knowledge of school-based educators.

Support for initially licensed teachers in the 15 partnership school districts now is viewed as the responsibility of both the schools and the university. Teacher education programs must continue to provide support for beginners in order to reduce attrition and support teachers' continuing development. Pilot programs along this line, as well as new initiatives, have received positive feedback and support.

A small research project sponsored by the partnership, which sought input from clinical teachers and interns regarding their preparation for the teaching of reading, generated qualitative data that can be used in curriculum redesign. Such research on curriculum and instruction has potential for continuous improvement of teacher education courses and programs if done through collaborative models. With this kind of sustained inquiry into real school problems, there is a greater chance of changing curriculum to meet the needs of teachers and practitioners.

Bridging the Cultures of the School and the University

The structure of the partnership helps promote the concept that the school and the university are connected and that improvements in one will occur only in concert with improvements in the other. The use of PDSs for in-depth, clinically based, collaborative work has as potential for bridging the two cultures in ongoing, meaningful ways - if there is a commitment and resource allocation from higher-level administrators in both settings.

FORT VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY

Fort Valley, Georgia, public university, 1060 education students

Implement a Charter Teacher Preparation Program to address the needs of traditional under-achievers, especially minorities, in an era of high accountability for educators and teacher preparation programs.

- Establish Partner Schools with Rural School Systems.
- Infuse Technology throughout the Teacher Education Curriculum.
- Create Culturally Responsive Instruction.
- Increase collaboration between Arts & Sciences, Education and K-12.
- Create a P-2 tract.

Consultant's Summary:

Fort Valley made a dramatic change in its goals after the first year of work. Initially, its proposal listed many of the same goals as at the other campuses. But, as the university began to address those goals at this rural, historically Black institution, the leadership team determined that the low performance of newly prepared teachers on state mandated tests was an urgent issue that needed more dramatic intervention. The changes then underway would be insufficient unless performance issues were addressed directly.

The Georgia Board of Regents announced its willingness to grant charter status to any college of education that wanted to make dramatic changes. Fort Valley was the first public institution to be awarded that status. The college is now developing a standards-based approach to teaching and assessment that requires that standards be met before students can progress in their programs. Making this change required changes in faculty and pedagogical practices so that time is a variable but meeting standards is not.

The college committed itself to working comprehensively with prospective teacher education candidates from their first day on campus, not waiting until they applied to the teacher education program two years later, as is common on most campuses. A team of arts and sciences and education faculty is delivering an integrated program of content and pedagogy, along with mentoring and study skills guidance, to this cohort of students. The emphasis is on students demonstrating that they are meeting standards before they move on to the next phase of the program. If this effort is successful over the next several years, it will be the single most profound transformation coming out of the ReCreating initiative.

FORT VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY

The University's Report:

Activities/Accomplishments:

- Implemented a Charter Teacher Preparation Program which features interdisciplinary clusters, teamteaching cohorts, and a standardsbased curriculum and delivery.
- Developed a Teacher Education Outcomes and Assessment Model; followed INTASC guidelines and specialty standards.
- Established Partner School arrangements with seven rural schools and implemented a teacher induction program in these rural schools.
- All faculty have undergone extensive training in the use of technology and in infusing technology throughout their teaching. All students must demonstrate competence on ISTE Standards.
- Established electronic classrooms.
- Implemented block scheduling to increase content integration and amount of time in field experiences. Expanded field experience to 450 hours prior to student teaching
- Implemented the use of Clinical Instructors.
- Implemented certification programs to train teachers for working with children ages 3-7.

Challenges:

- Maintaining momentum for comprehensive, systemic change when external governing entities make policies and/or laws that impact the process.
- Finding the fiscal resources to be able to keep up with the additional personnel and facilities necessary to meet the goals for planning, implementing and monitoring systemic change.
- Communicating with the various partners involved in systemic change in ways that are not time-consuming.
- Avoiding the burn-out of a small faculty when implementing and supporting a standards-based approach with students who have previously not demonstrated high achievement levels.
- Overcoming the shock experienced by students, faculty and parents of implementing a program designed with achievement at the forefront rather than remediation, and where there is no compromise on high standards.

FURMAN UNIVERSITY

Greenville, South Carolina, private university, 300 education students

Goals:

- Revise standards and procedures for admission and continuation in the teacher education program, and develop criteria for admission into the teaching internship.
- Design a transformed teacher education curriculum and experiences.
- Focus on attracting highly qualified minorities as preservice and school leaders.
- Create a renewed organizational structure through the Forum for Educational Inquiry (a center of pedagogy involving education, arts & sciences, and partner school personnel).

Consultant's Summary:

Furman is building on its liberal arts heritage and is moving from the traditional pattern of preparation to a five-year program that includes an internship. This is another example of a major transformation when this change is fully implemented. Furman's relationships with schools and districts are already much stronger since such a change is only possible when collaboration with schools moves beyond the typical student teaching pattern.

The University's Report:

Activities/Accomplishments

Revised Admissions Standards and Procedures

- GPA of 2.5 overall; a "C" or better in all professional education courses.
- Recommendations by professors of first three courses in education and by major department.
- Satisfactory completion of early field experiences.
- Satisfactory performance on Praxis I.
- Satisfactory writing sample.
- 25 hours of satisfactory independent work with children or youth.
- For acceptance into teaching internship, completion of a portfolio, panel interview, GPA of 2.5.

Revised Curriculum for Transformation

- Full-faculty approval of program structure for post-baccalaureate program (Furman Scholars and Leaders) in elementary, early childhood, secondary, and special education.
- State Board of Education approval of a pilot year-long teaching internship in elementary education, paid by Anderson School District One and counting as the intern's first year of teaching.
- Pilot study on the teaching of reflective thinking and practice. Recommendation to integrate into the teacher education program beginning fall, 2000.
- Comprehensive integration of instructional technology into the teacher education curriculum.

FURMAN UNIVERSITY

- A "master teacher in residence" employed for two years, to teach methods courses and support the senior block and year-long internship programs.
- Service learning required in the human development course.
- Increased teaching on-site in schools and community.

Diversity in Teacher Education

- "Preparation for teaching diverse student populations" infused into the teacher education curriculum.
- Created a new partnership with an urban middle school where prospective teachers are mentored by experienced teachers who are demonstrating success with diverse learners.
- Scholarship monies offered to attract minorities into teaching.
 Forged connections with Teacher Cadet programs and a local community college.
- Revised the advanced program in school leadership in conjunction with the DIAL program (Diversity in Administrative Leadership)

Forum for Educational Inquiry

- Developed new partner schools, along with a new partner district, led by a leadership team.
- Identified initiatives for simultaneous renewal with each of the partner schools.
- Identified common faculty development needs and activities.
- Planned a common "research in practice" agenda.
- Established a new position as a full-time director of partnerships.

Challenges

- Attempting to establish a formal partnership with a very large, urban school district takes extra time to "massage" the relationship, ease fears and competitiveness, and begin to share resources. On the other hand, the new partnership with Anderson District One, which is small and rural, has been much more easily accomplished, with true mutual respect and both sides contributing real resources.
- The process of changing from a four-year to an extended program is tricky. Some parents and current students have misinterpreted "choices" and feathers have been ruffled.
- TIME.....not enough of it!!! Smaller teacher preparation programs, by necessity, require the wearing of many hats by each faculty member.

E UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA-BIRMINGH Birmingham, Alabama, public university, 1,660 education students

- Establish a standards-based curriculum.
- Establish professional development sites.
- Model best practices including the use of technology.

Consultant's Summary:

The University of Alabama at Birmingham (UAB) embarked on a series of curricular changes with the goal of linking more closely with local schools. Progress was made in developing a few partner schools (although negotiations with the city school system were problematic), in enhancing the uses of technology, and in collaborative efforts with the arts and sciences. UAB named its new teacher education efforts "Educating Leaders for the 21st Century" (EL21). Progress was slow for several reasons. A key factor was the lack of a united effort by the school of education's leadership and the University's central administration. As a result, a change in deans occurred at the beginning of the third year of the project.

The University's Report:

Activities/Accomplishments

Establish a standards-based curriculum for UAB graduates. Progress in establishing a standards-based curriculum began by faculty rewriting the conceptual framework for teacher education programs. The conceptual framework was expanded into a handbook for students that explained the foundation upon which programs are based. To support the framework, topical strands (e.g., pedagogy, communication and personal skills, understanding and valuing diversity) were identified as organizers for the standards. The faculty relied upon the work of INTASC, the Alabama State Department of Education and the numerous learned societies to identify the standards for each program. These standards are being incorporated into the EL21 model in two phases:

- Pre-TEP: students take five courses prior to admission to the teacher education program (TEP): Education in Context I and Education in Context II, Service Learning, Education as a Profession, and Quality of Life. Courses were fully implemented in the fall of 2000.
- UAB restructured the courses and experiences for TEP students with the intent of including more clinical experiences. Special education is infused into the early childhood/elementary and secondary programs so that the teacher candidates are better able to teach the diverse student populations they will encounter. The program also includes an alternative math and science certification program, developed jointly with local schools. Student assessment is an important component of the program, and faculty now track progress via student portfolios.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA-BIRMINGHAM

Establish professional development sites (PDS). Four elementary and middle schools within the Birmingham Public School System provide an on-going laboratory for students to develop the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to become excellent teachers. Three UAB faculty members spend two full days each week in these schools. Local in-service teachers serve in the capacity of Expert Mentor Teachers (EMT), receiving a stipend to supervise UAB student teachers twice an academic year, observe, and offer reflective feedback. A university faculty member takes the role of EMT liaison, providing professional development opportunities for the cohort of in-service and pre-service teachers and collaborating with all parties to make the student teaching experience reflective, positive and productive.

Faculty model best practices including the use of technology.

During the ReCreating Teacher Education grant, significant changes were made in modeling best practices for pre-service teachers, in-service teachers and administrators in local schools. There is considerable variety in the practices modeled. For example:

- Faculty who work extensively with the Alabama Reading Initiative to retrain in-service teachers and university faculty regarding successful approaches for reading instruction.
- Professional development activities for teachers to use a hands-on approach when teaching elementary school science and every day mathematics.
- Professional development for local schools working to raise student achievement scores on the Stanford
 Achievement Test.
- The development of online courses and use of web-based instruction.
 CourseInfo™ is now used in 34 courses in addition to web-based courses.

One other significant accomplishment includes UAB's leadership role in the formation of the Greater Birmingham Holmes Partnership (GBHP) comprised of the four higher education institutions and ten local public school systems in the Birmingham metropolitan area.

THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

Gainesville, Florida, public university, 1,920 education students

Restructure elementary and middle school teacher education to prepare teachers who are capable of:

- (a) creating and maintaining supportive and productive classrooms for diverse student populations, and
- (b) working collaboratively with school personnel, families and members of the community to develop alternative ways of educating all children, including those who have traditionally been labeled hard-to-teach and hard-to-manage.

Consultant's Summary:

Florida was among the first of the major universities to move to an extended five-year teacher education program. Its ProTeach model of preparation was begun over a decade ago. The BellSouth proposal specified ways of enhancing the program, beginning with course changes and the development of faculty teams working with student cohorts. It has instituted its new approach with several groups of students and is moving to a full-scale implementation. Blending content in elementary and special education is one of the major outcomes in the new approach. Faculty team building was another move forward. As was true at some other campuses, a change of deans influenced the course of this work in the last year. However, the co-directors of the project had provided the primary leadership all along and served in leadership roles for the network as well.

The University's Report:

Activities/Accomplishments

In order to assure high quality teacher education, the University of Florida's restructuring effort included efforts to strengthen partnerships with public school colleagues, strengthen partnerships among College Of Education (COE) faculty and with Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS) faculty, increase faculty and student use of technology as a pedagogical tool, and strengthen performance assessment.

Key features of the redesigned program include:

- Students are encouraged to take advantage of a dual certification opportunity in elementary (or middle school) and special education.
- All students graduate with Elementary or Middle School certification and ESOL endorsement.
- Elementary senior methods experience includes 12 hour inter-disciplinary concentration in Liberal Arts and Science (LAS). All LAS courses are taken in conjunction with methods courses to facilitate the development of pedagogical content knowledge AND are taught in conjunction with public school faculty.
- Technology is taught explicitly and implicitly (i.e. integrated into how students are taught).
- Public school faculty work collaboratively with university faculty in developing and delivering instruction during at least five (out of six) semesters of the program.

THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

- Faculty collaborate across departments to deliver instruction.
- The program includes a more systematic focus on assessment, with performance outcomes specified for students at key points during the program.

Highlights of Florida's activities include:

- Through teacher education pedagogy mini-grants, faculty and public school colleagues experimented with alternate structures for teacher education courses (e.g. collaboration with a teacher in residence; creation of video-case materials; cross-departmental team teaching).
- Collaboration with school partners is increasing through: distant internship partners' collaboration; school partners' conference on inclusion; school partners' minigrants; local field experience planning task force.
- A teaching strategies project involved 30 teachers from three schools in collaborative planning for field experience in junior year.
 Teachers participate in staff development, model key teaching strategies for students, and assist students in implementing key strategies in their classrooms.

- A day-long collaborative planning retreat for COE faculty and faculty from Alachua County schools was used to plan a cohesive field component for senior year of the unified program.
- Distant internships were piloted with a small number of students in two districts in Fall, 1998.
 The effort was implemented in four districts in Fall, 1999 with 15 students. Interest among students and districts in increasing.
- On-going assessment has been tied to the Florida Accomplished Practices (knowledge and/or mastery are documented in each course or program experience, creating a portfolio of successful mastery of competencies). Plans are underway to link Accomplished Practices with the PRAXIS observational system (with DOE grant funding for Spring and summer 2000).

Challenges

In addition, Florida identified several challenges that were mirrored on other campuses:

- Collaboration with the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.
- The time involved in collaborative teaching across departments.
- Public school and COE faculty time in planning and delivering collaborative teacher education.
- The culture of colleges of education within Research I institutions: achieving an appropriate balance between labor intensive teacher education and expectations for research.
- The high stress culture of today's public schools: achieving a balance between the need to help children succeed on high stakes assessments and provision of an opportunity for novice teachers to teach.
- Sustaining a reform agenda in the midst of outside mandates.

THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE

Louisville, Kentucky, public university, 2,100 education students

Goals:

- Restructure teacher certification programs around the theme of "teachers as leaders and learners."
- Expand this theme to graduate teacher education programs.
- Structure the masters degree program into content-specific student cohort groups.

Consultant's Summary:

Although the project directors at the University of Louisville (U of L) changed three times and the beloved and highly respected education dean died mid-stream, this campus continued to serve among the leaders in the BellSouth network. The university hosted one of the network institutes and was the most proactive in using the online forum for collaborative work. Louisville already was among the leaders of colleges in education in developing a five-year program of preparation with an intensive clinical component. The college also was a pioneer in working with school systems to create professional development and partner schools. It has hosted a number of national conferences on working with PDSs and is acknowledged as a leader in this work.

Louisville's proposal to the BellSouth Foundation addressed one of the generally acknowledged weak programs in many colleges of education — the masters program for teachers. Frequently, these programs consist of fragmented courses taken over a number of years, often with little direct relevance to changing school and teacher needs. Louisville has redesigned its masters program by collaborating closely with cohorts of teachers, making the program directly linked to the world of practice.

The University's Report:

Activities/Accomplishments

Specifically, Louisville attempted:

- To link graduate work to specific school change initiatives.
- To focus intentionally on the development of teacher leadership.
- To arrange students in cohort groups.

BellSouth funding was used to encourage University of Louisville faculty and area school districts to develop cohorts of teacher/leaders who can challenge existing norms and reinvent K-12 schools to meet emerging needs. Pilot groups of candidates were formed around unifying themes that addressed a specified educational need in the candidates' schools or districts to complete real work toward meeting real K-12 student needs. The result is the design and implementation of new graduate programs for teachers and administrators.

THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE

Masters Level Students Cohorts:

During its three years of BellSouth Foundation funding, Louisville created a steering committee and work team comprised of university-wide faculty and staff, school colleagues, alumni, prospective graduate students and community representatives. This group developed a draft Program Handbook to guide the development of cohort proposals, cohort development and program design. Participants also conducted assessments of the initial certification programs to inform decision-making about the restructured graduate programs and created an on-going assessment process for all restructured programs. Much of the subsequent work was done in ad-hoc committees called "temporary structures."

Louisville then created pilot cohorts of students in several areas, including:

- Technology coordinators,
- K-12 social studies teachers.
- Louisville Writing Project teachers,
- K-12 administrators,
- Early childhood educators,
- 6-12 mathematics teachers,
- K-12 science teachers,
- National Board Certification candidates.

A leadership team is working with faculty and candidates in the cohort groups to complete research projects for publication and presentation as well as project documentation.

Other Effects:

The university also initiated a series of innovative faculty development activities, including:

- developing a research framework for teaching and learning,
- discussing the evolving nature of Professional Development School work,
- improving the use of portfolios in teacher education programs.

U of L expanded its Professional Development School network from 10 to 25 schools.

Challenges

Louisville identified several key challenges that are universal to other campuses:

- Leadership changes in the partnering institution.
- Prior role and time commitments of participants.
- Creating appropriate modifications to the cohort design.
- Policies that limit course credit for school-based professional development.

WESTERN KENTUCKY

Bowling Green, Kentucky, public university, 2,200 education students

Goal:

 Prepare teachers whose primary role is to facilitate the learning of all students at high levels through direct interaction and collaboration with colleagues, the family, the community, and/or support agencies.

Consultant's Summary:

Western Kentucky University (WKU) made a major shift in its work after the first year when it was clear that the faculty as a whole had not "bought into" or were even aware of the first ReCreating plan. Initial plans to work with a very large number of schools in the region proved to be beyond the scope of the faculty. The original focus on assessing the progress of students in the program was maintained, however. Changes in leadership energized the work being done. Using electronic portfolios as a way of unifying the performance and assessment aspects of their program became a central focus. This work was shared with the full network.

WKU played a role in focusing the whole network on collaborative work. A joint proposal to the US Department of Education was prepared. While it was not successful, the collaborative work proved to be a valuable exercise.

The University's Report:

Activities/Accomplishments

Kentucky schools are required to be accountable for the academic performance of all students and must show specified ongoing improved performance over time or face sanctions. WKU is working to expand interactions between teacher educators, academic departments, public school educators, parents and communities to achieve that goal and improve standards-based teaching and learning.

Currently, the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences at WKU has developed a set of partnerships with academic departments and public schools for the purpose of creating new initiatives and programs. Specifically, these programs will:

- increase the capacity of all programs in the School of Integrative Studies in Teacher Education (SISTE) to prepare teachers who can demonstrate their ability to positively impact the learning of all students;
- increase the capacity of experienced teachers to positively impact the learning of all students; and
- increase the capacity of schools to consistently improve the performance of students.

WESTERN KENTUCKY

Evidence that the above objectives are being achieved will include:

- Documented evidence, through continuous assessment, of improved student learning by teacher candidates and experienced teachers.
- Alternative programs for professional development of teachers and leaders to impact learning of students.
- Increased numbers of teachers who become National Board certified.
- Increased family involvement in and support for their children's learning.
- New structures and communication links to support standards-based teaching and learning.
- Presentations, publications and other communications to share what has been learned with professional educators, parents, policy makers and the public.
- The revision of all undergraduate and graduate programs which are now outcome/standards-based.
- Critical performances with accompanying scoring guides for the professional education component of all undergraduate programs and for the content areas.

Other ongoing work as part of WKUs "re-creation" includes the following:

Continous Assessment:

In an effort to strengthen the ties between the University and P-12 schools and to enhance the quality of graduates, WKU is investigating ways to document the impact of preservice students' involvement in P-12 settings on student learning.

WKU is developing electronic portfolios to manage student performances as part of the continuous assessment goal. Background research on the electronic portfolio has been completed and a prototype of a portfolio is ready. This prototype has been shared at two national meetings. The computer program to expand the use of the portfolio in all undergraduate teacher preparation programs is underway. Servers, capable of accommodating up to three thousand students, were purchased and faculty were trained in technology relevant to the use of the portfolio. Student technology skills associated with the portfolio are identical to those considered essential for all teachers and are being integrated in all programs. SISTE has completed the development of technology centers.

School Partnerships and Field Experiences:

To enhance the quality of school partnerships and field experiences, faculty and public school teachers have attended several professional development school conferences. A follow-up committee meets monthly. Pilot programs have been established in two schools. At the high school level, classroom teachers have played an active role in the methods courses taught in the schools and the scope of work of the university faculty members has changed. Faculty members in the secondary education program area are designing research projects relevant to the field experiences.

To increase the enrollment and matriculation of students from underrepresented groups, a Teacher Bridge program began during Summer 1999.

Finally, WKU continues to develop and perfect an interview process to better identify individuals with talent in the area of teaching.

Foundations and higher education institutions continue to dance together to the music of change. If real transformation is to occur, we must alter the dance's pattern.

LESSONS LEARNED

Perhaps the greatest value of the initiative was in the lessons learned about change in teacher education. This is part of a broader question: What is possible and perhaps impossible to change in higher education writ large?

Was the Initiative a Success?

Calling the effort "ReCreating Colleges of Education" was an overly optimistic expectation. Despite the many accomplishments, there were few breakthroughs that would justify calling the changes made a "recreation." Terms like "improving" or "strengthening" existent practices would be closer to the mark.

No fundamental changes were made in the pool of persons entering teaching. Only modest changes were made in the subject matter preparation of teachers. No major efforts were made to meet shortage areas in local schools. There were no serious examinations of whether the composition of the faculties involved needed to be changed. These matters were addressed but on the assumption that existing practices needed modification rather than that some of them needed to be abandoned in order to begin anew.

This assumption limited thinking about ways to expand the pool for teaching. Even where alternative tracks to preparation existed, they tended to be overlays on traditional practices rather than fresh approaches. In the main, truly innovative approaches were not visible. For the latter to have occurred, faculty members with the drive and energy required to be creative needed to be given opportunities to begin with a fresh slate, to redesign the preparation process from the ground up.

Some participants would legitimately argue that what they did was indeed a re-creation. Furman's move to a five-year program and Fort Valley's charter college initiative are examples, as was Berry's comprehensive approach and Louisville's new concept for the masters program. Assessing what was done across all eight campuses, however, the changes made were far more improvements than dramatic shifts. They were variations on themes rather than new music.

The Culture of Higher Education

The major problem that faced all of the campuses is the very culture of higher education.

All institutions are organized to ensure their continuation. The fear that persons might lose their jobs or be less competitive for the next job is but one factor that makes a higher level of change unthinkable on campuses. Most faculty members see their persona as being directly linked to their field, to the specialty in which they were trained. Anything that threatens their field or department is opposed in virtually a Pavlovian manner. The competition for resources is palpable and dilutes even sincere efforts to work collegially.

This characteristic of higher education is difficult for persons outside the academy to understand. It is a view contrary to the belief system, even within the academy, that universities are at the forefront of new knowledge and innovation. They may be when it comes to research. Academics are not reluctant to prescribe changes for others, but any internal reform is resisted with a tenacity that has been brought to a fine polish.

Although many faculty members and administrators worked hard to be innovative, the culture of higher education does not allow much flexibility. The rhetoric of higher education to the contrary, the structures and traditions of the academy make it almost impossible for anything but the most modest changes to be made. And the changes that are made must survive the painstakingly slow processes of review and approval that sap the energy of persons ready to implement them.

Further, faculty members have been socialized to the norms of the academy. This means that the ideas for change that will be brought forward will almost always conform to those norms. Persons in any institution or profession essentially "know" mainly what their institutions and professions accept as the conventional wisdom. This means that those in teacher education are limited in their ability to conceive new approaches to teacher preparation. We see ways to improve things but we do not easily accept serious challenges to what we were trained and hired to do. Many recognize this condition when they refer to the difficulty of thinking outside the proverbial box.

Even the much higher levels of collaboration between the colleges and local schools, an important outcome of this initiative, are tentative forays rather than deep changes that have redefined the work of most teacher educators. These changes may yet happen since it takes time for new practices to truly permeate a faculty. As has been noted, campus reward systems were often cited as making faculty wary of spending "too much" time in the field.

The labor intensive nature of a clinical approach to teacher preparation must compete at every turn with the higher education model of segmented courses and rigid definitions of expected behaviors. Almost any deviation from the norm is subject to subtle but powerful raised eyebrows. Work loads and reward systems simply must be altered at the beginning of a reform effort if serious change is to take place. Such a proposal is an alien concept in higher education.

Even the best, the most dedicated faculty can only go so far given the rigid nature of higher education. Progressive faculty members constantly need to deal with the resistance of colleagues not eager to alter programs or to spend more time in the field.

LESSONS LEARNED

Small versus Large Colleges

A related lesson that may have been learned was the ability of smaller colleges to move forward more expeditiously than the larger state schools. The highly compartmentalized structures of large institutions make change efforts much more difficult. Hence, collaboration with arts and sciences colleagues was desired but not easy to obtain on the larger campuses. And within large colleges of education, changes in elementary education are often in vivid contrast to the lack of movement in secondary programs. The other side of the coin, however – often sited by Berry and Furman is that faculty at smaller colleges are required to wear many hats and play several roles simultaneously.

Even the best, the most dedicated faculty can only go so far given the rigid nature of higher education. The structures and traditions of the academy make it almost impossible for anything but the most modest changes to be made.

A Note About Changing the Culture of Higher Ed Is there any hope that deeper changes in teacher education can be effected? Major changes <u>can</u> occur if faculty, administrators and trustees are ready to examine alternate approaches to organizations, programs and pedagogy. This <u>can</u> be done while preserving the ideals of the academy and the rights of faculty. Indeed, job security must be guaranteed to all affected by the changes being made as a precondition.

The process will require careful planning and multiple opportunities for faculty to shift to new responsibilities. Rewards need to be provided to those willing to be the first to move forward. It will require a determination to see the process to its conclusion. It will require different behaviors on the part of presidents, provosts, faculty and trustees. If faculty are to move in bold directions, campus administrators must do the same.

The Role of Administrators

The roles played by central administrations was another important lesson learned. While each central administration promised full support for the funded proposals, in some cases that support did not appear to be as strong as hoped for. On several campuses, central administrators did play visible and vigorous roles at key points. On other campuses, however, their support was not readily apparent. It must be acknowledged that, in at least three instances, presidents and provosts intervened when the ReCreating initiative was not moving forward. One president in particular played an exceptionally supportive role. Even so, there is no doubt that presidents can and must do more to champion and sustain change efforts.

It is difficult not to conclude that once a proposal is funded, central administrators are not likely to continue as active participants in the reform effort. Given the many responsibilities of presidents and provosts, explanations for why they cannot play more active roles are well known. At the same time, the ReCreating initiative, like any effort

at college-wide changes, needed the active involvement of central administrators throughout the process. Real reforms will not be sustained if treated in a business as usual manner. They need to be nurtured and protected from the relentless pressures to maintain the status quo. Most administrators are victims of these pressures as much as their faculties. Even so, pro-forma endorsements are simply insufficient.

Changes in the deanship occurred on six of the eight campuses. It is significant that the Foundation was not informed officially of these changes by any of the central administrations involved. If presidents and provosts were truly monitoring the ReCreating effort, informing the Foundation regarding what a leadership change meant to the future of the initiative would seem to be a reasonable expectation.

Any effort at college-wide changes needs the active involvement of central administrators throughout the process. Real reforms will not be sustained if treated in a business as usual manner. They need to be nurtured and protected from the relentless pressures to maintain the status quo.

Size of the Grants

The grants awarded ranged from \$150,000 to \$250,000. The lesson learned here was that the amount of the grant is not the critical determinant of what can be accomplished. There is no evidence to suggest that campuses with larger grants accomplished more than those with smaller grants. Nor is there evidence that a larger investment would have accelerated or deepened the changes made. This conclusion is contrary to the conventional wisdom that equates the size of a grant with its power to influence changes. It also is contrary to the belief that chasing more money is the way to make reforms happen.

How the money is used is the critical factor, along with the energy, ideas and perseverance of the leadership team. This is coupled with the degree to which the central administration and dean of a college are willing to make serious changes in their budget allocations. The latter does not necessarily require the infusion of new money. It is far more a question of the will to reallocate existing budgets so that they support the changes being made, with the grant serving as the "grease" for the "wheel" of reallocation.

So long as higher education changes are viewed as modifications of existing programs, finding new money will remain a prime activity. However, if the changes are replacements for existing programs, then the budgetary decisions needed are quite different in character.

There is no evidence to suggest that campuses with larger grants accomplished more than those with smaller grants. Nor is there evidence that a larger investment would have accelerated or deepened the changes made.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are based on my personal experience with the ReCreating initiative and a lifetime of study of teacher education and higher education. They derive from my conviction that the next wave of philanthropic help for colleges of education must be substantively different from past practices. They are in keeping with a growing conviction that concrete outcomes are far more important than the processes of change. Reforming teacher education is not a new idea. What is different now is that expectations must be escalated to a new level.

These recommendations are offered to help those institutions that are ready to go the distance in respect to teacher education reform — and to assist those foundations ready to fund them. They are predicated on the conviction that even the most progressive teacher educators can only go so far unless higher education institutions are truly prepared to serve public education. The ideas offered require approaches to awarding and monitoring grants that go beyond normal philanthropic practices and certainly beyond traditional academic practices.

Beyond Traditional Practices

To go beyond improving mainstream practices in teacher education, breakthroughs will include some or all of the following:

- Encouraging clusters of faculty
 to be free to invent completely
 different programs in an effort to
 foster fresh thinking and innovation.
 Too much emphasis is usually placed
 on seeking consensus and develop ing a one-size-fits-all program.
 Some faculty are far more ready
 to move quickly and they need to
 be encouraged to do exactly that.
- Recruiting different pools of candidates for teaching in partnership with schools. The assumption that teacher education should continue the pattern of working almost exclusively with undergraduates is not consistent with the needs of the profession. A variety of program options are needed, all of them clinical in nature.
- Employing rigorous and diagnostic admissions processes along with multiple entry points into alternative programs. While a commitment to performance is frequently stated, few major breakthroughs are emerging in this direction.
 Breakthroughs would include augmenting grades with performance assessment procedures (including the use of tests at appropriate points) as well as targeting admissions to shortage areas.

- Creating teams of faculty in education, arts and sciences and practicing teachers to implement the new programs. Tentative steps in this direction are evident on some campuses, but this cannot be accomplished fully without fundamental changes in load assignments and budgets. Having a few teachers share in the teaching of methods courses is desirable, for example, but it is not the same as having many teachers-in-residence as a part of the education faculty.
- Demanding total revisions of all content and courses taught in teacher preparation, predicated on a strong liberal arts background.
 Campuses alter many courses and engage in efforts to work with arts and sciences colleagues. But curricular changes, as messy and frustrating as they are, are only the beginning of changed practices. Shortage areas in science and math generally are not directly addressed. The subject matter preparation of elementary teachers remains an issue all too superficially addressed.

- Developing school-based, clinical approaches to preparation. Again, working with partner schools is something about which there is little debate and major progress is being made. But almost none of the programs are seriously challenging the campus-based mode of offering courses.
- Designing courses and programs that are directly related to the achievement of children in the schools in which interns and professors are working. Being a partner with schools means that the quality of preparation is directly linked to the quality of the school's student work. True partnerships require a shared sense of accountability for the learning of children.

Tying Philanthropic Investment to Results

Moving directly to the issue of money and how it is used, grants in the future should include a mechanism for returning all or some of an award if agreed upon outcomes are not reached by a date certain. The phrase "date certain" emphasizes that it is critical that outcomes are not dissipated by the meandering nature of campus decision-making.

If investments in reform are to bear fruit, this option needs to be considered seriously in order to attract the full attention of all concerned. The analogy here is to the way a home is built. A contractor receives money in stages as the foundation, framing, mechanical systems, etc. are completed. In a sense, the BellSouth Foundation came close to operating in this manner when it withheld second year funding from three institutions until some questions were resolved. Perhaps grants should be gradually escalated to a "balloon" allocation when changes in practices are fully operational.

I make this recommendation with the realization that it is the least likely to be acceptable. Even so, it is my conviction that future grants to higher education must have "teeth" if they are to make a difference.

Demand Evidence of Commitment to Change

When Berry College submitted its proposal, all the faculty involved signed the document. The importance of this sign of commitment and good faith was demonstrated by what was accomplished. This practice should be a requirement in all proposals. Furthermore, each person signing the proposal — including the dean, provost and president — needs to specify what he or she is prepared to do to implement the ideas in the proposal. The more specific these statements, the more likely positive changes will be achieved.

This recommendation goes beyond what most faculty members are willing to do or have ever been asked to do. And that is the point. Serious reform calls for changed behaviors,

not merely pro forma expressions of support. It is in what individuals say they will do that the essence of the reform will be found. Proposals should discuss actions far more than the rationales for the changes to be made. The rationales are the smoke; what people commit themselves to doing is the fire. If faculty and administrators are not willing to declare themselves on what they each will do to achieve the changes outlined, they are less likely to submit a proposal. This is a highly desirable outcome and will make the selection process more effective.

Serious reform calls for changed behaviors, not merely pro forma expressions of support. It is in what individuals say they will do that the essence of the reform will be found.

Future grants to higher education must have "teeth" if they are to make a difference. Provisions in grants should include a mechanism for returning all or some of an award if outcomes are not reached by a date certain.

Emphasize Implementation Rather than Planning

Little to no monies should be allocated until after an institution has completed its plans to alter or replace curricula and other practices. This suggestion challenges the assumption that supplementary monies are needed up front before making changes — a deeply held conviction on campuses. The assumption that faculties will need time to deliberate before changes can take place is no longer a sufficient reason for a grant to be awarded.

Planning programs, altering curricula, and holding meetings associated with academic traditions are normal activities on any campus. They do not require support beyond what can be called "coffee and donuts" awards. More than any other profession, and especially compared to teaching in K-12 schools, college faculty have many opportunities and degrees of freedom to engage in planning as a normal part of their responsibilities.

Because the involvement of teachers and students is vital to this work, up-front seed money for participation of these persons would be appropriate. A faculty retreat might be needed to get things moving. Such activities would be the only exceptions to a decision not to support planning activities. No support should go for

efforts to achieve a consensus on goals. There should be no waiting for this or that group to approve the changes. If faculties and administrators are not at this stage of agreement on new programs and practices, their institution is simply not serious about reform.

Planning is important, but it is not where the action is. These activities take agonizing periods of time with positive outcomes not necessarily assured. They make sense to academics, but they are of no consequence to those concerned about public education. Faculty meetings are not where students are taught in new ways or where work with schools is advanced.

Grants should be available only for putting a new program into full operation. They should not support the process of planning and legislating changes. Proposals should be funded only when the timetable for planning changes is completed and faculty and students are ready to begin the new program. Rather than including explanations for what an institution hopes to achieve, proposals should instead contain terse statements along the following lines:

This is what we will do. These are the faculty who will do it. These are the students in the programs. This is the date we will begin.

The definition of acceptable matching funds also will need redefinition. Institutions must show how internal budgets will be shifted to support new practices. Institutions not prepared to make the hard reallocation decisions required should not be eligible for support.

Planning is important, but it is not where the action is. Grants should be available only for putting a new program into full operation.

ReDefining Faculty Lines

A Prescriptive Approach

In the ReCreating initiative, institutions were encouraged to specify how they might use vacant faculty lines to advance the changes being made. This idea was offered as a suggestion in the RFP rather than as a requirement. Some new faculty appointments may have been influenced by the initiative, but such decisions are deeply embedded in the academic culture and seldom are revealed beyond the campus.

It may be far more important for a college to pay stipends to teachers working with faculty in teaching methods classes or to recruit teachersin-residence to the campus than it is to replace a given professorial vacancy. It may be necessary to "sunset" some programs in order to release funds for the changes being made. These are the kinds of hard decisions that are needed at the beginning of the process. They cannot be left to the internal battles over faculty lines that frequently undermine the best of intentions. True innovation requires the abandonment of some old practices and programs.

While the value assertions in the BellSouth Foundation ReCreating RFP suggested the kinds of changes the Foundation would support, the initiative was not prescriptive in nature. Each institution defined what it wanted to do and established its own mileposts. As a fresh approach, foundations should consider articulating highly specific changes in teacher preparation and induction that they are willing to fund. Only institutions ready to make those specific changes should be considered for funding.

A prescriptive approach to funding means that no monies would go for anything other than support to faculty and students. Supplies, secretarial help, equipment, travel and related items must remain the responsibility of the institution. A premium should be placed on stipends to K-12 teachers, students and faculty doing the work. Those persons taking the lead, the risk takers, should be visibly rewarded. Institutions must make a commitment to continuing and expanding those rewards when the grant has ended.

I further recommend that foundations not only specify the ideas they will fund, but also require that the institution implement these by a date certain. As already noted, all of the planning would be completed as a precondition of funding and, if outcomes were not reached, monies would be returned.

Foundations should articulate highly specific changes in teacher preparation and induction that they are willing to fund. Only institutions ready to make those specific changes should be considered for funding.

It may be far more important for a college to pay stipends to teachers working with faculty in teaching methods classes or to recruit teachers-in-residence to the campus than it is to replace a given professorial vacancy.

Five-Year Preparation Programs

The literature and debate regarding the need to move teacher education beyond the baccalaureate level is extensive. Based on what has been learned at institutions that have transitioned to post-baccalaureate programs, it is clear that this transition generates far more extensive results than any other approach to teacher education reform.

If teacher preparation is to be reformed, the transition to five-year programs is the single most effective way of generating a host of interrelated changes. The existing teacher education curriculum simply must be changed, and new agreements with the arts and sciences must be formed. Only then will teachers have stronger subject area backgrounds. In a fiveyear program, elementary teacher candidates will earn their undergraduate degrees in the arts and sciences. Teacher preparation will become a post-baccalaureate process. Student teaching will be abandoned and replaced by intensive internships. Negotiations and partnerships with schools must take place in order to create internships and to involve teachers in the process. Faculty must spend more time in partner schools. All of these changes are more likely to occur in a five-year preparation process. Improving the four-year pattern is essential, but it is not the same as a total re-design.

Resistance to what is recommended here is high. Nonetheless, the minor adjustments made in arts and sciences accomplished under the rubric of "collaboration" are not sufficient. To meet the new content and pedagogical standards for teachers, a baccalaureate degree in the arts and sciences is needed. It should be followed by intensive, clinical internships jointly designed by colleges and schools. This model has the highest potential to effect serious changes in the preparation and induction of new teachers. This model also makes it easy to invent alternative tracks for post-baccalaureate and second career persons.

In this era of teacher shortages, it will be argued that five-year programs decrease the number of candidates and that this is not the time to limit entry into the profession. Interestingly, this same argument was used before the shortage issue became acute. In fact, however, the transition to extended programs did not lead to a decline in enrollments at most institutions that made this change. Because this is a volatile period in respect to staffing schools, institutions may well have to expand existing programs while at the same time changing them. Clearly, answers to shortages go far beyond what colleges of education can or will do.

If teacher preparation is to be reformed, the transition to five-year programs is the single most effective way of generating a host of interrelated changes. This model has the highest potential to effect serious changes in the preparation and induction of new teachers.

Charter Colleges of Education

The charter college concept presents an even stronger model than the fiveyear program as an engine for change. Indeed, the transition to the five-year program is but one aspect of a far broader charter college proposal.

In essence, a charter college is one in which the normal piecemeal approach to academic change is replaced by a comprehensive effort. As in the k-12 arena, a charter college is one where a total redesign of programs and faculty will occur. Normal campus approval processes, state requirements and the traditions of academia would need to be waived to encourage innovative approaches, always by a date certain.

The decision to become a charter college will not be easy. It will require agreements by faculty, provosts, presidents and trustees, along with the state department of education and state higher education authorities. These agreements would allow the college of education at a given institution to implement a series of interrelated changes in curricula, teaching practices, faculty loads, relationships with schools, admissions and assessments within a prescribed time limit. These changes also would almost certainly require changes in the organizational structure of the college and perhaps the university. Staffing decisions would need to be made. The reward system would need to be changed. In short, all aspects of a college's work would be redefined at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

In the charter concept, colleges of education faculties would include a cadre of teachers-in-residence, going beyond the token teacher or two that is the norm. Funding teachers-in-residence along with faculty who teach in school-based methods courses will require budgetary decisions by the institution.

To implement charter colleges, institutions will have to increase funding to colleges of education or the colleges will need to reallocate vacant faculty positions for new purposes. This will mean closing some programs to create new ones. It certainly means that the preparation of teachers becomes the single highest priority of a college, often a serious issue in large research institutions.

The reward system will have to be changed to visibly and generously reward faculty working with schools and conducting scholarship on such work. The agreement to reward field work would be an "up-front" decision and not something to be left to the vagaries of academic decision making as in the past. If a faculty is expected to do different kinds of work, they need more than a promise that such work is valued. Departments may need to be changed along with leadership roles. Faculty loads would reflect the labor-intensive nature of such work.

To truly achieve a new college of education, two parallel colleges will need to be operated over several years. The charter college will initially be staffed by those faculty ready, willing and able to move forward on new ideas. Faculty not ready to make the transition will continue to operate the old programs until students who enrolled for those programs have graduated. Operating "new" and "old" colleges may be difficult, but it is not impossible. It is perhaps the only way to accelerate serious reforms.

The charter concept offers the highest potential for creating the lighthouse institutions needed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

All new resources will go to the charter college and inducements will be available to faculty in the "old" college to move into the new college each year, until a date certain. The date certain will be when all faculty members must transition to the new practices. This may appear impossible, but such transitions can be achieved in a humane and positive way for virtually each faculty member.

The complexity and implications of the concept go without saying, and any institution willing to embark on this voyage will deserve support. But if serious and major reforms are desired, the charter concept offers the highest potential for creating the lighthouse institutions needed.

The choice for funders and other reformers is clear: Major investments in a few institutions willing to go the distance, or smaller investments in a larger number of colleges that will make modest changes? This is a painful decision because there are strong faculty members ready to make changes at many colleges. Smaller, more numerous grants would help them. The breakthroughs needed, however, are such that I must advocate the larger reforms at a fewer number of institutions.

The charter idea as outlined is based on the assumption that existent colleges of education can be reformed. Another approach would be the creation of a new institution designed from the ground-up as an exemplary charter college. Foundations are in the perfect position to work with the stakeholders willing to consider this idea.

The choice for funders and other reformers is clear: Major investments in a few institutions willing to go the distance, or smaller investments in a larger number of colleges that will make modest changes.

Differentiated Staffing

A final way of advancing reform to better prepare teachers and link schools and universities is in the concept of differentiated staffing. This recommendation is one to be implemented within K-12 school districts that are partnering with colleges of education, as well as on campuses.

Differentiated staffing has a mixed history. Teacher aides and some volunteers are common, but the assumption that there must be a teacher for a specified class of students is cast in stone. With teacher shortages now a major concern, this may be the right time to propose an initiative to introduce team approaches to teaching that are based on differentiated staffing. Signing bonuses and increased pay for teaching in urban schools, for example, are but two practices that were deemed impossible to implement a few years ago.

If schools organized their instructional programs around teams of master teachers or other certified teachers, interns and paraprofessionals (including college faculty where possible), the pressure to have a teacher for every class could be eased considerably. As has been demonstrated many times, teaming makes possible far more individualization of instruction and flexibility in the uses of time and staff. Advancing the concept at this time would build on the leadership potential of National Board for **Professional Teaching Standards** certified teachers.

It would also reduce the tensions about inducting entering teachers at various levels of training. All persons preparing to teach would serve as interns on teams led by National Board certified and other outstanding teachers. Utilizing persons from alternative programs would be more defensible since they would be a part of teams rather than given the full responsibility for classes.

This approach would also blend teacher preparation more closely with the work of teachers. An initiative could be devised to link a school system and a college in a joint approach to preparation and teaching that would require differentiated staffing on both sides of the equation.

The university involved would commit to an internship model that would be consistent with a school system's team approach. Like the charter college idea, this concept would require a host of agreements. Salary scales would need to be adjusted as well as probationary periods for teachers. In effect, the internship would become the entry point for all new teachers.

An initiative along these lines would be consistent with a foundation's goal of pulling together its work with schools, universities and policy makers. Funding would be shared by campuses and school systems mutually committed to implementing a new approach to staffing schools and providing instruction.

If schools organized their instructional programs around teams of teachers, interns and paraprofessionals, the pressure to have a teacher for every class could be eased considerably. This approach would also blend teacher preparation more closely with the work of teachers.

CLOSING NOTE

The **BellSouth Foundation** ReCreating Colleges of Education initiative helped eight very different colleges to advance their work from very different starting points. Each was able to design and implement changes more quickly than it might have done without an outside push and certainly more broadly than if each had been working alone. This report has attempted to provide an overview of the difficulties of making campuslevel changes and of linking and induction preparation practices — even at institutions where the will and support for change is present.

The colleges that participated in BellSouth Foundation's ReCreating initiative deserve credit for struggling with difficult matters often ignored by colleagues in other disciplines and for succeeding to varying degrees. I am proud to have been associated with many fine people who worked hard and persevered given the frustrations endemic to making any type of change in higher education.

The recommendations offered in this report are predicated partially on lessons learned from the initiative. They build on what the best teacher educators have struggled to achieve at institutions where the gap between the rhetoric of reform and actual change is great.

These recommendations, however, go beyond what was learned through the BellSouth Foundation ReCreating initiative. If an investment is to be made in teacher education, there must be even higher expectations regarding the outcomes anticipated. Institutions serious about reform must be ready to

implement changes before they are funded, not the other way around. They will need to accelerate the process of change. They will need to actually reform their programs rather than simply improve them, a distinction that goes beyond semantics.

What needs doing is not "rocket science" but it will require changes in colleges that go beyond curricular reforms or the refinement of existing programs. Equally important, major changes must be accomplished in ways that both enhance the ideals of the academy and result in better achievement for K-12 students as well. Those ways will be discovered by creating new programs that view recruitment, preparation and induction as practices to be re-invented rather than improved.

If there are no risk takers, piecemeal change will remain the norm — and this approach has gone as far as it can go. Radical innovation offers the best hope for teacher education and all of higher education.

What needs doing is not "rocket science" but it will require changes in colleges that go beyond curricular reforms or the refinement of existing programs. If there are no risk takers, piecemeal change will remain the norm – and this approach has gone as far as it can go.

APPENDIXA

A DESCRIPTION OF NETWORK MEETINGS

Network meetings of the ReCreating Colleges of Teacher Education group were held at least three times each year. Usually these were for campus faculty teams of from four to eight persons; sometimes only project directors and deans attended. In addition to the specially organized network meetings listed, the Foundation also organized convenings at professional association conferences regularly attended by faculty, e.g. American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education and American Educational Research Association. The frequency and regularity of the network gatherings served to build a valued sense of camaraderie among participants and to keep momentum going

Date	Location	Topics/Presentations	Who	
Fall 1997	Atlanta GA	Building a network	Project Directors, Deans	
March 1998	Raleigh NC	Connections to national/state/regional policy and other teaching quality efforts Team planning	Faculty Teams	
		Presentations by NCTAF, USDOE, NC Governor Hunt's Staff, Columbia Group		
September 1998	Knoxville TN	Working in cross-discipline teams Embedding K-12 teachers into the process	Faculty Teams	
		Presentations by U.TN-Knoxville faculty		
August 1998	Atlanta GA	Planning 2nd year of the network	Project Directors, Deans	
November 1998 Louisville KY		Professional Development Schools Performance/portfolio assessment Electronic portfolios/other technology efforts Diversity issues		
		Presentations by Alverno College and campus te	ams	
April 1999	Olympia WA	Student cohort models, nontraditional curricular/organizational models	Faculty Teams	
		Presentations by Evergreen College faculty		
June 1999	Bellevue WA	"In Praise of Education" presentations	Faculty Teams	
September 1999	Atlanta GA	Planning 3rd year of the network	Project Directors, Deans	
November 1999	Atlanta GA	Network planning for data collection and culminating conference	Project Directors	
March 2000	Sun Valley ID	Sharing lessons with Albertson grantees Mentoring another network Linking to standards and data	Faculty Teams	
		Presentations by AACTE, Institute for Educational Inquiry	Faculty Teams	
June 2000	Atlanta GA	Final network meeting Discussion of next steps	Project Directors, Deans, Faculty Teams	
		Presentation on tying campus reform to student achievement results		
		Individuals called upon for presentations and/or technical assistance: • John Goodlad, Director, Institute for Educational Inquiry • David Imig, American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education • Gary Galluzzo, National Board for Professional Teaching Standards • Barnett Berry, National Commission on Teaching and America's Future • NC Governor Jim Hunt's education staff • Terry Dozier and US Department of Education staff • John Dornan and other Columbia Group members • Alverno College Teacher Education Department • Faculty of all campuses visited and/or participating		

• Faculty of all campuses visited and/or participating

APPENDIX B

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS: A SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

As the initiative neared completion, a survey instrument was devised and mailed to 371 faculty at all eight campuses. Persons receiving the questionnaire were identified by a dean or director of the ReCreating initiative on each campus. The lists included teacher educators and selected faculty in the arts and sciences.

The respondents were assured that their responses would be anonymous. The questionnaires were not coded by institution. While a survey of this type would normally be designed to make it possible to analyze responses across campuses by institution, faculty rank, discipline, gender, ethnicity and perhaps other variables, it was decided that an aggregate of responses would be sufficient. As in this report, the goal was to provide an overview rather than to diagnose the work of each campus.

The responses to the questions asked were analyzed, along with sample comments from the respondents. The depth of commitment to the initiative among some faculty is evident, along with less encouraging interpretations. One hundred and thirty-one (131) persons returned the questionnaire, a response rate of 35%.

Normally, this would be a respectable response rate to a mailed questionnaire. In this instance, it was disappointing, since the goal throughout the ReCreating effort had been to encourage large-scale faculty involvement in the re-design of teacher preparation. The design of the questionnaire and its length may have been factors. Despite these and other reasons, the lower than anticipated response rate is a matter of concern and perhaps a finding. If the ReCreating effort was indeed the powerful engine for change that was intended, it is reasonable to assume that a greater percentage of faculty members would have been interested in expressing their views.

The overall thrust of the responses suggest that the ReCreating effort made a difference on the campuses. However, the findings reported here must be interpreted with caution. They should not be generalized beyond what they represent: the perceptions of those faculty members who chose to respond. The selection of the respondents, the items on the questionnaire and the interpretation of the findings are valid only within the context of the ReCreating initiative.

APPENDIXB

RE-CREATING COLLEGES OF EDUCATION SURVEY

Dear Faculty Member:

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather a cross-section of faculty perceptions regarding teacher education changes that have been made at the eight campuses comprising the ReCreating Colleges of Education Network. The questions reflect issues often discussed at Network meetings over the past three years.

Your responses will help the BellSouth Foundation in its continuing efforts to support advances in the preparation of teachers. The questionnaire is not coded according to institutions or institutional types and your responses are confidential. The results will be analyzed as a composite of views and perceptions across the eight campuses.

Please circle the number that best reflects your views on the scales ranging from STRONGLY AGREE(SA) to STRONGLY DISAGREE(SD). Feel free to add comments at any point.

Thank you for returning the questionnaire on or before May 1, and especially for your contribution to strengthening teacher preparation on your campus.

Leslie Graitcer Executive Director BellSouth Foundation

1.	Admission standards have been strengthened as part of our re-creating effort.	AGREE 50%	DISAGREE 23%
	The responses to question one were spread across the ten point scale as follows: SA 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 SD 10(21); 9(9); 8(21); 7(15); 6(14): 5(9); 4(6); 3(5); 2(4); and 1(15). No answer(12). Total responses: 121. To summarize the responses, the choices leaning toward the strongly agree pole(10,9,8,and 7)were combined: 66 or 50% of the responses. Choices leaning toward the strongly disagree pole(4,3,2and 1) were combined: 30 or 23%. The percentages reported for all the questions utilizing the ten point response scale are reported based on this tabulation procedure.		
2.	Our data suggest that that a stronger cohort of students is being attracted to teaching because of the changes we have made.	AGREE 45%	DISAGREE 25%
3.	Our approach to assessing teaching skills is based on teaching and subject matter standards that go beyond grades earned in courses.	AGREE 73%	DISAGREE 8%
4.	The pool of potential teachers has been expanded by the development of post-baccalaureate or alternative programs on our campus.	AGREE 50%	DISAGREE 21%
5.	Compiling data on the quality and performance of our teacher education students is a high priority in my college.	AGREE 67%	DISAGREE 13%
6.	We have made good progress on recruiting a more diverse student body.	AGREE 47%	DISAGREE 25%

7.	Research on the effectiveness of our programs is a high priority of the teacher education faculty.	AGREE 69%	DISAGREE 11%
8.	Our program is predicated on working with teachers and schools in ways that go beyond what we were doing before the re-creating effort was begun.	AGREE 76%	DISAGREE 8%
9.	In comparison to secondary programs, the elementary program has been more amenable to change.	AGREE 40%	DISAGREE 25%
10.	Offering methods courses in school settings in cooperation with teachers is a high priority in the new program.	AGREE 74%	DISAGREE 11%
11.	Faculty members are spending more time in schools as a result of the changes made in teacher preparation.	AGREE 73%	DISAGREE 9%
12.	Achieving consensus on the standards to guide our program has been a difficult part of the process.	AGREE 47%	DISAGREE 25%
13.	Teachers were significantly involved with faculty in the redesign of our program.	AGREE 56%	DISAGREE 15%
14.	We have redesigned our masters program to better serve the in-service needs of teachers.	AGREE 51%	DISAGREE 27%
15.	Teachers are part of the instructional program on campus and in courses offered at school sites.	AGREE 60%	DISAGREE 10%
16.	The subject matter preparation of elementary teachers has been enhanced as a result of our curricular changes.	AGREE 56%	DISAGREE 15%
17.	Collaborative work between faculty in education and the arts and sciences has increased over the past three years.	AGREE 53%	DISAGREE 20%
18.	The science and math backgrounds of elementary education students remains a major problem in our program.	AGREE 30%	DISAGREE 30%
19.	I am spending more time with student teachers or interns in the schools as a result of the changes we have made.	AGREE 44%	DISAGREE 20%
20.	My use of technology for instructional or communication purposes has increased because of our program changes.	AGREE 65%	DISAGREE 16%
21.	More faculty are engaged in team teaching as a result of the changes we have made in our program.	AGREE 56%	DISAGREE 18%
22.	The scholarly interests of the faulty have shifted to a focus on the effectiveness of our programs.	AGREE 47%	DISAGREE 22%
23.	Teacher preparation is a high priority on this campus.	AGREE 63%	DISAGREE 21%
24.	Support from the provost and president has been positive and tangible for our redesign efforts.	AGREE 49%	DISAGREE 27%
25.	Teacher education is a high priority in my work and career.	AGREE 86%	DISAGREE 3%
26.	The campus reward system clearly supports the work of faculty in partner schools.	AGREE 27%	DISAGREE 47%
27.	The level of faculty involvement in making changes in teacher education clearly increased over the past three years	AGREE 69%	DISAGREE 10%
28.	The re-creating effort has helped the college to respond to state mandates.	AGREE 70%	DISAGREE 11%

29. My sense of worth as a faculty member has been enhanced by the work we have accomplished over the past three years.	AGREE 53%	DIS <mark>AG</mark> REE 23%
30. I am proud of the changes we have made in teacher education.	AGREE 73%	DIS <mark>AGREE 15</mark> %
31. I am proud of the response of the faculty as a whole to the re-creating effort.	AGREE 66%	DISAGREE 17%
32. The changes being made would likely have taken place even if the college had not been part of the re-creating network.	AGREE 24%	DISAGREE 44%
33. Five of the eight campuses experienced changes in the deanship over the past three years. Changes in leadership hampered our redesign efforts.	AGREE 19%	DISAGREE 58%
34. Despite all of the work done over the past three years, our redesign of teacher education has not gone far enough.	AGREE 59%	DISAGREE 19%
35. Unanimity is often difficult to achieve on any faculty. On my campus, naysayers often slowed our progress.	AGREE 34%	DISAGREE 37%
36. Taking into consideration the inevitable "ups and downs" in any change effort, the re-creating process on this campus has been successful.	AGREE 66%	DISAGREE 13%
37. The future of teacher education on this campus is likely to be more positive because of the changes we have made.	AGREE 70%	DISAGREE 12%

38. What are two or three major changes that you would attribute to the re-creating effort on your campus over the past three years?

The responses to this question are not categorized and tabulated here because no clear patterns were discernable. The replies were highly particularistic and in terse statements. Respondents noted the gamut of every change that took place across the eight campuses. For example: higher standards, better prepared students, ESOL, closer ties with schools, more interest across campus, professional development schools, assessment is required, more technology, team teaching, standards, fifth year added, more emphasis on research, curriculum changes, and so on. Had the survey been coded by campus, it might have been possible to delineate patterns for each campus.

39. What are two or three ways in which you have been involved in the redesign of teacher education on your campus?

As with the previous question, no clear patterns were discernable. The responses essentially reflected the normal ways faculty work on a campus. For example, working on committees, serving as a chair, revising courses, redesigning a program, attending meetings, developing electronic portfolios, designing interdisciplinary content, leading the initiative, participating in collaborative research, and so on.

- 40. We all know that no one change is sufficient. Even so, what is the one change you want to see made in your program?
 - Again, the responses covered too broad a range for any meaningful patterns to emerge. They essentially mirrored responses to the accomplishment noted for question 38. This can be explained by the fact that each person's perceptions of what was done or needs doing varied campus to campus. At the same time, some indications of next steps were discernable: mentoring programs for non-traditional students, more emphasis on technology, more support from presidents and provosts, more collaboration with schools, secondary programs as strong as elementary programs, more diversity, rewarding work in schools, additional revisions to graduate programs, more field-based teaching, closer working relationships with schools, "new blood" (on the faculty), more content courses, and so on. These and a host of other comments suggest that while progress was made in many ways, much work remains to be done.
- 41. Please add any comments on the re-creating effort on your campus or on your involvement in the process.

Forty three persons responded to this question. Responses ran the gamut from strongly positive to negative or noncommittal. (Copies of all comments are available from the BellSouth Foundation.)

APPENDIX C

CONTACT INFORMATION FOR PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Richard Wisniewski Consultant to BellSouth Foundation LaConner, WA 360-466-4149 rwisniew@earthlink.net

Berry College Dr. Jacqueline A. McDowell Mt. Berry, GA 706-236-2202 jmcdowell@berry.edu

East Carolina University Dr. Marilyn Sheerer Geenville, NC 252-328-1000 sheerem@mail.ecu.edu

Fort Valley State University Dr. Curtis Martin Fort Valley, GA 912-825-6365 martinc0@mail.fvsu.edu

Furman University
Dr. Lesley Ann Quast
Greenville, SC
864-294-3389
lesley.quast@furman.edu

University of Alabama-Birmingham Dr. Donna Hester Birmingham, AL 205-934-5322 dhester@uab.edu

University of Florida Dr. Dorene Ross Gainesville, FL 352-392-9191 dross@coe.ufl.edu

University of Florida Dr. Rod Webb Gainsville, FL 352-392-0726 rwebb@coe.ufl.edu

University of Louisville Dr. Diane Kyle Louisville, KY 502-852-0572 diane@louisville.edu

University of Louisville Dr. Beth Stroble Akron, Ohio 330-972-7651 stroble@uakron.edu

Western Kentucky University Dr. Sam Evans Bowling Green, KY 270-745-4662 sam.evans@wku.edu